Encyclopaedia Aristasiana

Find in Entire Site Go

Backlinks...

Menu

Home
Search
List pages
Last Changes

Image Galleries

Main Sections

Aristasian Glossary
Aristasian Life and Culture
Aristasia Pura
Aristasia in Telluria
Philosophy and Religion
Sound and Kinematics
Telluria Criticism

Random Pages

Amity
Art Neo
Masculi
Sai Herthe's Day
The Vikhelic Arts
Being in Thame
Aristasian Politics
An Aristasian Glossary
The Seven Great Janyati

Search

in:
Entire Site Go

Login

Login as...
User:
Password:
Login

Standard | Secure

Social Constructionism

"Post-modernism is the logical corollary of modernism: if you want Descartes, you must have Derrida"

The Aristasian Critique of Social Constructionism

Wikipedia's article on Social Constructionism states:

> Social constructs are generally understood to be the by-products (often unintended or unconscious) of countless human choices rather than laws resulting from divine will or nature. This is not usually taken to imply a radical anti-determinism, however. Social constructionism is usually opposed to essentialism, which defines specific phenomena instead in terms of transhistorical essences independent of conscious beings that determine the categorical structure of reality.

Aristasians are Essentialists in the most fundamental sense - we believe (as do all traditional peoples) that all forms have their source and origin in the Celestial Archetypes. That Forms themselves are rays of the Supernal Sun, or ideas of the Divine Mind rather than accidental by-products of matter.

Strange as this idea may seem to the thoroughly-indoctrinated West Tellurian, it has been (expressed in a variety of cultural languages) a fundamental belief of all cultures until very recently. And when we say "very recently" we mean - to a large extent - until the late 19th century.

In the 17th century, the rationalist doctrines of the so-called "Enlightenment" introduced a philosophy inimical to Essentialism and from then forward, West Tellurian culture was in a mildly paradoxical condition, in which it was logically trying to reject the traditional concept of Form, but did not have the means to do it (much of the recent "philosophical tradition" of the Tellurian West from Descartes to Kant and Hegel is the history of intellectual struggle with this dichotomy).

The Darwinian thesis appeared to resolve the question by presenting a mechanism by which Form could be seen as an "accidental" by-product of matter. This - even more than the

Animal Thesis itself - was why Evolutionism was so important and revolutionary. This is also why loyalists of the current West Telluri outlook know that they must defend it, even if they have no knowledge of biology or the issues involved. They sense that the loss of "Evolutionism" would entail the loss of everything they hold dear - and they are right.

It can be easily demonstrated that Darwinian Evolution, even if it were true, cannot, in the light of what has been learned since, dispose of the question of Form. But that is not important. In the popular mind, the Darwinist story-picture has become, as Miss Trent says, a Pseudomythos - a replacement for true mythic accounts which present to us (in forms our minds can prehend) the nature of being.

And since this pseudomythos, by a sleight of hand, appears to dispose of Form as one of the two elements of being, reducing all to the lower pole of Matter - it can indeed be seen as an Antimythos.

Why go into all this? Because the Pseudomythos was - and is - revolutionary. The modern concept of sex was created by the Pseudomythos with its logical corollary the Animal thesis.

Similarly the modern "social constructionist" school is only made possible by the Pseudomythos. Forms are manifested not only in physical beings, but in human stories, and cultural forms. Not only did the Moon exist long before the piece of rock that manifests it to this particular world, but the Princess existed before the first maid was born.

"Social constructionism" is simply the application of de-formism to the cultural realm and as such is entirely dependent on the form-rejecting worldview founded on the Pseudomythos. While it may shock some of the milder modernists, it is only the logical corollary of their own view of the world.

So, people who believe the modern view of "s*x" to be essential - because it is the only thing they know, and because their religions - if they have religions - have re-shaped their view of human relations around this view (they have to because it is the only view either pastor or congregation can now understand) - these people are actually pseudo-essentialists. Their hearts are in the right place - but they no longer have the intellectual equipment to be real Essentialists. They have been disinformed by the Pseudomythos.

Late West Tellurian social constructionism is thus the logical corollary of the Pseudomythos rigorously applied to earlier stages of Pseudomythic thought which have sentimentally attempted to retain a measure of pseudo-essentialism.

The academic success of post-modernism/social constructionism depends partly, it is true, upon the cultural

perversity of the current West Tellurian academic climate. But more fundamentally, it is successful because it is logically valid. It is attacking other Pseudomythic positions that, while they accept the same fundamental basis of de-formism, apply it less rigorously. They are thus completely vulnerable to the thoroughgoing application of the logic of their own position.

Created by: miss_serena. Last Modification: Friday 13 of March, 2009 12:19:42 EDT by miss_serena.

Powered by TikiWiki CMS/Groupware